

Message

From: Wharton, Steve [Wharton.Steve@epa.gov]
Sent: 12/10/2018 4:13:09 PM
To: Aviles, Jesse [Aviles.Jesse@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: Ongoing work in OU2

Hi Jesse – Thanks for this response. I'll send Kim an abbreviated response, once I have some more information.

With regard to the draft construction completion plan, please help me understand the purpose of this document. I am concerned that we don't approve a report from CCoD that conflicts with the final Pol-Rep for the removal work at OU2.

Also, we should set up a time to talk about your transition back to Region 8, and how the timing of that transition looks at this point.

Steve

Steve Wharton, Unit Chief
Superfund Remedial Response and Federal Facilities Program
EPA Region 8, Denver, CO
Desk: 303-312-6935
Cell: 303-264-8038
wharton.steve@epa.gov

From: Aviles, Jesse
Sent: Monday, December 10, 2018 7:01 AM
To: Wharton, Steve <Wharton.Steve@epa.gov>; Chergo, Jennifer <Chergo.Jennifer@epa.gov>; Edewaard, Kara - DEH CE2267 Environmental Public Health Analyst <Kara.Edewaard@denvergov.org>
Subject: RE: Ongoing work in OU2

Hello Steve:

The answer is that the work that CCoD is doing is, mostly, beyond the area of OU2. The CAG is aware of the extension of CCoD's project since the beginning. The drawings and explanation of the project never hid the extension of it. As Kara answered, any work done by CCoD within OU2 will follow the plans in place. The rest of the questions dealing with groundwater and the site boundaries we have answered before many times. The CAG can ask CCoD to participate on their meeting to discuss the non-Superfund work of GLO. It is up to CCoD to participate. The work that falls within OU2 boundary can be discussed in the quarterly meetings. As for the plans, I'm reviewing the Environmental Monitoring and Maintenance Plan Kara sent and should have my review complete by the end of this week. I can place the construction completion draft plan in the OneDrive folder I shared with the CAG. Kara sent me a link to download the report but I didn't. I asked her to resend the download link.

Jesse

From: CAG Administrator <vbi170cag@gmail.com>

Sent: Monday, December 10, 2018 09:16

To: Wharton, Steve <Wharton.Steve@epa.gov>; Chergo, Jennifer <Chergo.Jennifer@epa.gov>; Aviles, Jesse <Aviles.Jesse@epa.gov>; Benevento, Douglas <benevento.douglas@epa.gov>

Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)

Subject: Re: Ongoing work in OU2

Steve,

I've been trying to wrap my mind around Kara's explanation of the addition of a rather lengthy (second) wall of steel pilings.

Early on in the construction of the channel steel piling was installed due to the existence of a significantly higher volume of groundwater than expected. The pilings were meant to be a temporary barrier while the channel was being built. As it turned out, the higher than expected volume of groundwater caused CCoD to determine it needed a more permanent solution. The temporary pilings therefore became the permanent situation.

A question that several community members have raised since the installation of the steel pilings is, how is it that the volume of water present at the site has been such a surprise to the agencies and contractors working on this project? Why wasn't a risk assessment of the project completed to account for possible issues such as the actual flow of groundwater? I've digressed a bit though...

My understanding was that the original pilings were supposed to address groundwater issues that could be problematic for construction of the channel itself. Pilings have to be set 10-30 ft into the ground. How is it then that such work would equate to minimal soil disruption? Whether or not the location of the park and pilings is outside of the historic landfill, it is still located within the 4.5 square miles of the Superfund site. Thus, any soil movement has the potential to disrupt long-time buried heavy metal particulate and other contamination. Therefore, I will ask you again, why wasn't the CAG informed about this work? I request that you direct CCoD to attend the December 18th CAG meeting to present the work done to date, mitigation work being done and plans for site construction through the remainder of the project.

An additional question I have for you, what is the nature of the issue at the site that required a (unplanned) wall spanning the length of the site from just south of the east side of the bike path all the way to the northwest corner of the park at Arkins and 38th to be built? And if your response is the ongoing presence of a significant of the volume of groundwater, then what risks exist to the park landscape and to park visitors when the 'temporary' pilings are removed? Will the pilings be removed?

Btw, will you please send me copies of the Draft Construction Completion report and the updated Draft Environmental Monitoring and Maintenance report? Thank you.

Regards,

Kim Morse

Wharton, Steve

to me, Jennifer, Jesse, Kara

Hello Kim,

Jesse and Jennifer are out of the office, but I wanted to respond to your message about the activities at Operable Unit 2 of the VB/I-70 site. Earlier today, we received the message included below from Kara at the City and County of Denver regarding the installation of a new set of sheet pilings in OU2. These are related to the development of this portion of the site into the park that will include the Globeville Outfall Structure. While performing this work, the contractor should be complying with the same requirements included in the Materials Management Plan and Methane, Odor and Dust Control Plan that applied to the first phase of the project.

While there will be some movement of soils during this phase of the work, this will be outside of the area of the known historical landfill and should be much less intrusive than the construction activities associated with the storm water conveyance.

If you have additional questions or concerns, please let me know.

Thanks,
Steve

Hello Jesse, Steve, and Jennifer,

Per Kim's email, these **temporary** sheet piles were installed as part of the next phase of work in the park to construct the park features. Ames Construction needs to work on the north side of these sheet piles and the intent is to keep their work area dry (reduce groundwater influx). There will be some minimal soil removal / disturbance in this phase; the major grading and excavation effort was completed in the first phase under the Removal Action. Ames Construction will continue to comply with the Materials Management Plan and the Methane, Odor, and Dust Control Plan established in the first phase.

I submitted the Draft Construction Completion Report and the updated Draft Environmental Monitoring and Maintenance Plan to EPA in November.

Please let me know if you have any other questions.

Regards, Kara

Kara Edewaard

Environmental Project Manager
Department of Public Health & Environment
Environmental Quality | City and County of Denver

PHONE: 720-865-5432 | CELL: 303-854-8248

Follow us [@DDPHE](#)

Steve Wharton, Unit Chief

Superfund Remedial Response and Federal Facilities Program

EPA Region 8, Denver, CO

Desk: 303-312-6935

Cell: 303-264-8038

On Wed, Dec 5, 2018 at 6:25 PM CAG Administrator <vbi170cag@gmail.com> wrote:

Steve, Jennifer, Jesse, Mr. Benevento,

The VB/I-70 Community Advisory Group was informed that the removal action at OU2 was completed in August (2018). With knowledge, shared by Kara, that the removal action draft completion report was due to the EPA by the end of November, I had made a note to myself to contact you to request a copy of the report this week.

Having been under the impression that the major soil work had been completed at the site, I was surprised to receive an email late last containing the GLO images attached to this email. From the looks of these photos, it appears that significant work, involving additional digging and soil movement is still underway at the site after the supposed August completion. Specifically, these photos were taken last week, 3 months after we were advised that the removal of soil had been completed and construction scorecards were no longer being created.

At a (CAG) meeting over the summer Kara and Ryan informed CAG members of CCoD's revised site plan to permanently retain the pilings that were originally installed for the purpose of the dewatering project. However, these photos show a second wall of pilings that far exceeds what was in place during the dewatering phase of the project. As soil continues to be dug up and moved for this project, I'd like to know why the CAG was not informed of this work and why reporting on soil quality and /or contamination is not being made available. Will please you tell me about what I am seeing in these photos and why CAG was not informed?

As a point of reference I am including the site image reflecting the sheet piling alignment from the (Draft) Final Design Report Addendum 3 gw piling document. The legend within the document specifies the formerly temporary, now permanent sheet piling that was originally installed for the dewatering project. The solid magenta line reflects the new sheet piling wall shown in the images contained within this email.

Regards,

Kim Morse
VB/I-70 CAG Administrator